

SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE INPUT - NORTHEAST

The Northeast subcommittee was especially concerned with the preservation and protection of natural features, including creeks and waterways, areas of notable topography, and existing stands of mature trees. It was the opinion of the subcommittee members that these natural features presented the best opportunities for park and recreational amenities within the Northeast area. It was further stated that institutional uses, such as schools, were best suited for location in close proximity to valued natural features, as these uses had demonstrated an increased sensitivity towards preservation and protection of natural features. Residential uses were also considered appropriate in close proximity to natural features, but were considered more likely to damage or diminish the natural features through the development process. Intense land uses such as commercial and industrial uses were not considered appropriate in proximity to natural features, and the Northeast subcommittee members felt these uses should be discouraged in areas with valued natural features. The Northeast subcommittee was also concerned with further developing existing trail and path opportunities in relation to the existing natural features, especially waterways.

The Northeast subcommittee also expressed concerns over any residential development that would be inconsistent with the existing development pattern of the study area. The Northeast subcommittee identified the study area as predominantly agricultural and rural in character, and stated that any new residential development introduced to the area should emphasize consistency with the current development pattern. If inconsistent densities and housing types were to be introduced to the study area, emphasis on appropriate transitions and context-sensitivity would be necessary. The Northeast subcommittee voiced concerns relative to the provision of adequate public infrastructure to mitigate the impact of any new residential development, and recommended any new development be directed to the areas where existing infrastructure was adequate to absorb the traffic impacts, additional water and sewer contribution, and additional surface drainage contribution.

The Northeast subcommittee expressed concern over the introduction of commercial uses into parts of the study area not adjacent to major thoroughfares. Concerns were also voiced regarding disconnected, piecemeal development along major thoroughfares and the negative impact this could have on the effectiveness of the existing transportation network. The committee voiced a preference for integrated commercial developments, with access provided through frontage road networks. Support was voiced for connection to abutting residential areas both through local roads and alternative transportation networks, such as paths and trails, to limit additional impact to major thoroughfares.

The Northeast subcommittee further expressed concern over large-scale, high-intensity, highway-oriented commercial development. A preference was voiced for low-intensity, low-impact commercial establishments oriented toward serving the needs of the abutting residents as opposed to a regional population. It was stated that commercial development of this nature would be of a lesser visual, audible, and traffic impact, and thus preferable. Regardless of the scale or scope of any proposed commercial development, the Northeast subcommittee indicated that landscaped green space should be provided, both along the thoroughfares and adjacent to abutting uses as a transitional element. Some support was voiced for commercial developments integrating mixed uses, including light industry and multi-family dwellings.

The Northeast subcommittee was concerned with the introduction of industrial uses to the study area, due to factors including appearance and traffic impact. It was the opinion of the Northeast subcommittee that intense industrial uses were least compatible with residential use and natural areas, and were unlikely to be appropriate within the study area if developed as stand-alone facilities. Some support was voiced for the integration of industrial uses into larger commercial developments, when the commercial development could function as a transitional use between the industry and residential uses. Extensive buffering and separation was recommended. The Northeast subcommittee also stated that connectivity should be provided through local street and

trail networks, to allow persons employed at any potential industrial use to reach the use without the use of major thoroughfares.

The Northeast subcommittee expressed a desire for improved transportation connectivity throughout the study area, regardless of any proposed development or lack thereof. The subcommittee indicated that overall connectivity could be improved through upgrades to existing main streets, particularly through widening. There was also support expressed for street improvements that would result in a park-like appearance, with landscaped medians and street trees. The Northeast subcommittee stated that east to west connectivity should be maintained and improved. The subcommittee also emphasized the inclusion of bike and hiking trails in proposed connectivity improvements, and supported improving trail networks autonomously from other transit improvements.

VISION STATEMENT

The vision of the Northeast residents is of a community that includes distinctive, interesting housing of a high quality, regardless of lot size, house size, or housing type. This vision includes respecting and protecting unique natural areas and resources, maintaining the existing topography, establishing community trails, creating park-like corridors to ease increased traffic, and providing a high level of transportation connectivity, including attractive non-motorized pathway options. The residents also envision this area as characterized by accessible and clearly-defined commercial corridors established along US 31, State Road 32, and State Road 38, and offering appropriate transitions and buffers. The Northeast subcommittee envisions their study area as being well served by adequate public infrastructure resources, incorporating amenities and support services, and including both public parks and natural open spaces.

PLANNING ISSUES

Housing-
Quality (repeated theme)
Unique designs

Density-
Some concerned, some not
Provide transitions between dissimilar uses

Industry-
Considered undesirable

Commercial-
Restrict to corridors, unless in PUD
Support community
Some desire, some don't

Infrastructure-
Should be adequate for new and existing development

Transportation-

Improve overall connectivity in quadrant

Improve capacity of streets, especially 191st, Grassy Branch, and Moontown

Wider streets, parkway appearance

Incorporate alternative transit network – bike and walking trails

East / West connections need to be maintained

Natural Features-

Protect

Incorporate into transit network

Use to connect public facilities, schools

Cool Creek

Maintain rural appearance

Other Influences-

External Influence of Noblesville and Geist

Existing MF recommendation

31 Corridor

32 Corridor

38 Corridor

S.W.O.T. Analysis

Strengths-

Rural Settings

Low Density

School System

Convenience to Urban Areas

Adequate Commercial Services

High Quality Farmland

Quiet

Low Density

Proximity to Indy

Growing

Lack of Development

Accessibility to major roads

Weaknesses-

Traffic

Lack of Sidewalks

Access to Professional Employment

Influx of High Density Housing

Drainage Issues

Lack of Well Defined Trails

Inadequate Road System

Poor Road Maintenance and Design

Opportunities-

Well Planned Development

Concerned Citizen Input

Option to Retain Rural Character

Enhance Community Strengths

Control Commercial Growth

Planned Improved Road System

Guide Development

Establish and Maintain Firm Ground Rules

Threats-

Loss of Rights of Way
Increased Noise Level
Increased Light Pollution
Increased Crime Level
Overload Schools
Poorly Controlled Development
Cookie Cutter Homes
Unresponsive Town Council
Loss of Property Value
Taxes
High Density Housing

CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT

Parks Criteria For Development-

Alternative Transportation Routes
Maintain Parkland Along Natural Resources – Ex.: Cool Creek, wetlands, wooded areas
Open Space as a resource, separate concept from parks

Institutional Criteria For Development-

Alternative Transportation Routes
Schools Near Natural Resources / Parks and Trails
Monitor Drainage

Industrial Criteria For Development-

Create Connecting Roads, Frontage Roads to Residential Areas
Buffers – sound barriers or green space
Locate Along Main Thoroughfares / Access to Main Thoroughfares
Minimize Traffic Impact

Commercial Criteria For Development-

Create Connecting Roads to Residential Areas / Frontage Roads
Alternative Transportation Routes i.e. Trails
Visual and Sound Barriers, Buffers – green space, landscaping
Multi-Family opportunities – intermixed w/ commercial
Minimize negative visual impact / maximize green space along corridors
Locate Along 31, 32 & 38 – major thoroughfares / Close proximity to intersections
Low Impact Commercial / no high intensity commercial
Scale/ Scope: Commercial to service local community
Business/retail/commercial/multifamily – mixed use
Large scale integrated development preferred vs. smaller, unconnected developments
Mixed uses i.e. Keystone at the Crossing

Residential Criteria For Development-

Prioritize Preservation of Natural Resources – Trees, waterways, topography
Connectivity to Residential Areas to take pressure off main roads
Multi-Family Buffers
Some multi-family along corridors, Higher density towards main roads
Utilize infrastructure
Regulated density
Service provisions
Preserve rural lifestyle

Quality regardless of housing size, style, or type